

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

A corrected drawing of Figure 1 is enclosed.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 27, 36, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Appropriate amendments have been entered above.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 36, 37, 41, 42, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,787,294 (hereinafter “Envoy”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,564,329 (hereinafter “Cheung”), further in view of U.S. Patent 6,266,776 (hereinafter “Sakai”).

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) ¶ 2143.03).

Independent claims 1, 19, 28, and 37 of the present application include limitations not disclosed or suggested by Cheung, Envoy, nor Sakai. As a result, claims 1, 19, 28, and 37 are over Cheung, Envoy, and Sakai.

In particular, applicants' independent claims include the claim limitation, or limitation similar thereto, of:

... a system management controller to multiplex multiple management commands onto a system management bus in one signal for transmission to multiple system components to change settings of performance registers inside the system components.
... (emphasis added) (Applicant's claim 1).

Neither Cheung, Envoy, nor Sakai disclose nor suggest, a system management controller to multiplex multiple management commands onto a system management bus in one signal for transmission to multiple system components to change settings of performance registers inside the system components, as claimed by applicant, in at least claim 1.

Therefore, as a result of neither Cheung, Envoy, nor Sakai disclosing nor suggesting applicant's claimed limitations, applicant's independent claims are patentable over Envoy in view of Cheung and Sakai.

In addition, the remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims as discussed above, and therefore include similar limitations, and as a result are also patentable over Envoy in view of Cheung and Sakai.

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call John Ward at (408) 720-8300, x237.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 12/20/04


John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300